the question and do that work. A Special Officer has been appointed for the purpose. We feel that a Committee might be better and we are considering that aspect of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore General Clauses (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill will now be taken up clause by clause.

Clauses 2 to 14. The question is :

"That clauses 2 to 14 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 14 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

"That clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

"That the Title and Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore General Clauses (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore General Clauses (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE EVACUEE INTEREST (SEPARATION) MYSORE SUPPLEMENTARY BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Mysore Supplementary Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

Sir, in the Central Legislature, this Bill was introduced and also passed on 27th September 1951. Regarding this legislation, it is seen that it is not enough if the Central Legislature passed the Bill, but it should have the support and the consent of the States also. At first, it was thought that a resolution by various States supporting the Bill was sufficient. Accordingly on 10th November 1951, a supporting resolution was passed by this House under Article 252 of the Constitution. Similarly, other States also sent in their supporting resolutions. But it was found that the resolutions passed by the various States did not come in time or came in the form other than the correct form. Therefore, they were requested to pass this supplementary legislation in support of the Central Evacuee Separation Bill. Regarding the principle of the Bill, it has already been sufficiently discussed on the previous occasion. I may say this much. The evacuees who left the country left several dependents and relations who had interest in the property. How should such joint property be dealt with? Part of it was in the title of the gentlemen who left the country and the other part with the people who were left behind. Therefore, provision has been made in the Central Act as to how they should be divided and dealt with. In order to do this, this supplementary Bill has been put before the House for its consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Mysore Supplementary Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will now take up the Bill clause by clause.

Clause 2. The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

"That clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Mysore Supplementary Bill, 1953, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved.

"That the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Mysore Supplementary Bill, 1953, be passed."

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—I fail to understand the reason why this Act shall be deemed to have come into force from 15th December 1952.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The Centre has to extend this Act throughout India from that date.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—Why, Sir ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Why, I cannot say.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I really wanted to know why it should be given retrospective effect. If it is the intention of the Central Government that the Act should be supported by a resolution passed under Article 252 of the Constitution by the State Legislature, then, Sir, that resolution has already been passd as long ago as on 10th November 1951.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It was passed by the Centre on 27th September 1951 and the resolution supporting it was passed by us on 10th November 1951.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—The Evacuee Interest (Separation) Act was thereafter passed by Parliament. In view of the lacunæ which have come to the notice of the Government about which the Hon'ble Minister has not been communicative--for we would have been grateful to him if he had told us what those lacunæ have been and whether any of those instances have originated in Mysore—they have now suggested that the necessary supplementary legislation may be passed by the State Legislature and given effect to as from 15th December 1952. Why should 15th December 1952 be the date from which this Act should come into force ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have already described the lacunæ found. I shall read the same thing.

"The resolutions of the various States under Article 252 were passed before, during and after the Legislation, and the supporting resolution from this State has been dated 10th November 1951, obviously after the date. The other reason was, some States have in their resolution included a limitation of the period within which Parliament might legislate. That was an infringement of the powers of Parliament."

These were the two lacunæ. They have addressed all States to pass this supplementary legislation and fixed a date, perhaps, not to complicate matters further as to from which date it should come into operation. Hence, we have adopted the date given by the Central Government.

12 NOON.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಓಡಿಹೋಗಿರುವವು ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಗಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವಂತೆ ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನದವರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಓಡಿ ಬಂದಿರುವವರ ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? Is there reciprocity in this matter in Pakistan also?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We expect reciprocity and proceed with goodwill.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—What is it to-day, Sir?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We want to do justice irrespective of what they are doing.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ರೆಫ್ಯುಜೀಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನದಲ್ಲೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವಿಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಓಡಿಹೋಗಿರುವವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಅವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಓಡಿಬಂದಿರುವವರ ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸುರಕ್ಷಿತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ, ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು enact ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have no information to give at present. But I shall forward the good suggestion of the Hon'ble Member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Mysore Supplementary Bill, 1953, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE MUNICIPAL LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

Motion for consideration.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this is a very simple measure and I have nothing to add to the observations contained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೂ 23-1-1950ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಂದವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಒಪ್ಪಂದದ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರು ತಮಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸ್ವಂತ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರು ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ 1950 ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದ 1953 ಇಸವಿ ಈ ತಹಲ್‌ವರೆಗೂ ಅವರ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಕಂದಾಯವಾಗಲಿ, ಅವರ ಮನೆಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ತೆರಿಗೆಯಾಗಲಿ ವಿಧಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 6-2-51ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಿಧಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಮನೆಗಳಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೆಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ 61ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸ್ವಂತ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇವರು ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

"No tax of any kind imposed as aforesaid shall be leviable in the City of Mysore in respect of the Palace and the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto, belonging to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore."

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.)

ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಡಿಲೀಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಸ್ವಂತ ಆಸ್ತಿಯಿವೆ ಲೆರೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಮಾನಾವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಮಾಡದೆ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೊಂಚ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

> "In the City of Mysore in respect of the Palace and the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto, belonging to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore."

ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅರಮನೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೇ ಹೊರತು ಅದು ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಸ್ವಂತ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ತಾವು ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಈ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಅವರ ಆಸ್ತಿಯಮೇಲೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಲು ಆಗ ತಾನಾಗಿಯೇ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಮನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಸುತ್ತಲೂ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ನಿವೇಶನ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕಾರಣವೇನು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ Statement of Objects and Reasons ನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೇನೂ ಇದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಡಿರುವಂಥ ಅನುಮಾನಗಳೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಶಯಗಳೂ ನಿವಾರಣೆಯಾಗುವಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಾವುವೂ ಈ Statement of Objects and Reasons ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (64) ರ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋವನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ಸಾಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಇದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು ? ಈ ಅರಮನೆ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ವಿಶದೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಈ 64ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟೇ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. T. KEMPARAJ (Bangalore South—Scheduled Castes).—Sir, it is an indisputable factor that the properties belonging to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore should have also been taxed long ago. When we are having a popular Government and when we have accepted that there is no discrimination from person to person and when we have accepted that every adult of 21 years of age is entitled to exercise his vote I do not know why particular exception should have been made in the case of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore that his buildings and property should not be taxed. The Palace in which His Highness the Maharaja is living, if it happens to be the property of the Government, it is evident that the building cannot be taxed. Again why should there be an exemption for the car used by His Highness ? I have to put a question directly : is there any other person except the Maharaja who is exempted from being taxed like this ? I want this clarification from the Hon'ble Minister.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, a similar amendment was proposed by Sriyuts P. Sitharamiah and T. S. Rajagopala Iyengar to this Bill in the Legislative Council and Sri K. Puttaswami just now suggested that all private properties of His Highness should be taxed. On 6th February 1951 the State Government issued an order that the private properties of His Highness the Maharaja would be liable to taxes in future, the Palaces at Mysore and Bangalore being however exempt from all taxes, Municipal, State or Central. In order to give effect to the Government Order dated 6th February 1951, it is necessary to amend the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation Act, 1949, the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933, and the Mysore Town Municipalities Act, 1951. My friend Sri K. Puttaswami said that the Palace was a Government building and that it should also be taxed.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I want to know whether Palace is not the property belonging to the Government ?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—According to the agreement made between the Governor-General of India and His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore on 23rd January 1950 the Palaces at Bangalore and Mysore should be exempted from all taxes,

Sri V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna).—According to the agreement, does the Palace belong to Government or the Maharaja ?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—That is not made quite clear.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ತಾವು 1951 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಅಗ್ರಿಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಈಗ ಓದರಾಯಸಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಅರಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳು ಮತ್ತು open space, ಇವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಅರಮನೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದುವುಗಳೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸರಾಗದೆಂದೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ದಾಖಲ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ದೆಂದೂ ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರರಾಗಿದೆ.

For the proper use and enjoyment of the Palace, the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto are also necessary. A house will include garden and out-houses appurtenant thereto, and there seems to be no valid reason to exclude the buildings attached to the Palace from the Palace for taxing purposes. amendment propose is not acceptable

12-30 P.M.

*Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The Honourable Minister seems to have misunderstood me. The Palace and the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto which belong to the Government and which are Government properties are exempt from taxation. There are several buildings within the precincts of the city municipality and the city municipality is not entitled to tax those properties. If the Palace and the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto belong to Government, then there is no need to bring this amendment. The only limiting factor for the city municipality is that the properties belonging to His Highness the Maharaja are not liable to be taxed under the Mysore Act VII of 1933 (the City Municipalities Act) and there is a proviso. If that proviso is deleted, then the municipality gets the right to tax those properties and instead of doing that, Government have thought it fit to substitute a new clause for that clause. This clause creates a lot of misapprehension. By a reading of this clause, anyway, I formed an impression that the Palace and the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto belong to His Highness the Maharaja and even if in the agreement the Palace is declared to belong to the Government, what about the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto ? They have prepared a list of inventory wherein the buildings belonging to His Highness the Maharaja have been enumerated. So, for our purpose, to enable the City Municipality to tax the properties belonging to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, it is enough if the proviso to Section 64 is deleted and the Hon'ble Minister has not made the matter clear whether the Palace and lands appurtenant thereto belong to Government or not.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I wish to clarify the position. According to the Agreement, the Palaces at Mysore and Bangalore are deemed to be the private property of His Highness and they have been exempted. The other properties which were also exempted under the City Municipalities Act of Mysore are now brought under taxation. It is made clear in the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it the personal property of His Highness the Maharaja.?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is the private property of His Highness.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I would request the Government to lay before this House a copy of the Agreement. I am sure I have definite information that according to the Agreement, the Palace at Mysore City belongs to the Government and not to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore and I know that the Palace was built at a very heavy cost at the expense of the State treasury. I cannot understand the Hon'ble Minister when he says that the Palace is the private property of His Highness the Maharaja. Unless a copy of the agreement is placed and the inventory that was prepared at the instance of the States Ministry is placed before this House, possibly

(Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.)

it will be very difficult for us to agree to this Bill being passed.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We shall consider the question of placing the Agreement between His Highness the Maharaja and the Government of India on the table of this House.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—In view of that, the Bill may be postponed.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—On the basis of the Agreement as the Government understand, this Bill has been brought before this House. It has been made clear in the Statement of Objects and Reasons:

> "On the 6th February 1951, the State Government issued an order that the private properties of His Highness the Maharaja will be liable to taxes in future, the Palaces at Mysore and Bangalore being, however, exempt from all taxes, Municipal, State, or Central."

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Why was an exception made thus?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It has been thought desirable.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—My friend Sri Puttaswamy wants the issue to be clarified. I once again state that the Palace, as pointed out by my Hon'ble colleague, is the private property of His Highness the Maharaja and for the proper use and enjoyment of the Palace, the buildings and lands appurtenant thereto are also necessary. Mere Palace alone ....

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—Let not the Hon'ble Minister make a statement admitting that the Palace is the private property of His Highness. Let us find it out from the Agreement and then talk about it.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—After finding it out from the Agreement, we have placed this Bill. Without coming to the conclusion, the Government cannot place this Bill. If the Hon'ble House wants to examine it, I think there ought not to be any objection. We will consider that position.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Again, a 'house' shall include 'a garden,' out-house, open space, appurtenant thereto' and there seems to be no valid reason to exclude the buildings attached to the Palace. Because, it is just like an engine without a body, a motor-car without having a body. Giving merely the Palace to His Highness is of no use. The buildings and open space attached to the Palace must be given to His Highness and they are exempt from all taxes.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—To whom the buildings appurtenant to the Palace belong? Will the Government refer to the list of inventory prepared and state whether the buildings appurtenant to the Palace belong to His Highness the Maharaja or to the Government?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The word 'appurtenant' itself indicates the position. It goes along with the Palace.

*Sri B. NARAYANASWAMI (Mysore City South).—I am given to understand that there are about 138 buildings belonging to the Rajpramukh and I want to know whether those buildings are also exempt from all taxes.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We have indicated the scope of exemption here. Other properties will come under taxation.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMI.—So, the buildings other than the Palaces and lands appurtenant thereto that are now to be taxed ought to come within the purview of this amendment.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The scope of this amendment is here before the House.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMI.—The Government have sprung a surprise. We were all under the impression that the Mysore Palace was the public property and as my friend Sri K. Puttaswamy puts it, that Palace was constructed by public money and we were given to understand that it was a public property and Government property.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—If any Hon'ble Member has any doubts on this, an appropriate motion will clarify the position.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMI.—I wish that unless this position is clarified, this Bill be postponed for this simple reason. It is a very serious matter. The House should be in a position to know what are the private properties that belong to the Rajpramukh and what are the private properties that are in his possession that belong to Government and as such, we need not pass this Bill in haste and unless we have the inventory that has been made wherein it has been said that such and such property belongs to the Rajpramukh in his private capacity and such and such property belongs to Government and unless those particulars are furnished, we will not be in a position to give our assent to this Bill.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—I would like to invite the attention of the House to article 238 (4) (ii) of the Constitution :

"In article 158—

"(ii) for clause (3), the following clause shall be substituted, namely—

"(3) The Rajpramukh shall, unless he has his own residence in the principal seat of Government of the State, be entitled without payment of rent to the use an official residence and shall be also entitled to such allowances and privileges as the President may, by general or special order, determine."

*Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—At this particular juncture, probably the Minister who is in charge of the Bill is willing to make an appropriate motion in this regard and he is feeling some difficulty in regard to the inventories and in regard to the properties that are to be given away to the Rajpramukh as private properties. I make this particular appeal that this Bill may be referred to a Select Committee and taken up in the next session.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—On a point of order, Sir. Unless the motion for consideratoin has been passed, no motion for reference to a Select Committee can be made.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. This is not the stage.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Therefore, Sir, I think that the motion which Sri Linganna made would not be admissible.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I am sorry ; I never knew that the Bill was at the consideration stage. I withdraw the motion.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sir, as explained by the mover of the motion with reference to this Bill, the position seems to be a little nebulous. I think this House is entitled to know exactly what the position is with regard to the ownership of the Mysore Palace and the Bangalore Palace. Now, Sir, the terms of the Agreement between His Highness the Rajpramukh and the Government of India are contained in a document which, I am afraid, has not been available to all members of this House for a variety of reasons. It would be exceedingly helpful if the concerned Minister will do us the favour of reading out the relevant clauses in the Agreement which have any bearing upon the question that is now engaging the attention of this House. If we proceed on the assumption that the palaces and the buildings appurtenant thereto are the private or the personal property of His Highness the

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

Rajpramukh and the terms of the agreement eventually do not bear out that position, we should be putting ourselves in an exceedingly awkward position. I think we owe it to His Highness the Rajpramukh as much as to ourselves that we should know exactly what we are about. If, as the Hon'ble Minister for Local Self-Government tried to point out, there is any distinction to be made between private property and personal property, I must confess, Sir, to my mind, the distinction is not at all clear, and if he will explain that a little further, I think the Members of the House would be in a better position to understand the objects of the Bill. It is also not explained why, though as long ago as on 6th February 1951 the State Government issued an order that the private properties of His Highness the Maharaja will be liable to tax in future, no action was taken to make the necessary amendment in the Municipal Act so as to invest authority in the Corporation and the Municipalities concerned. Now, Sir, if the Hon'ble the Law Minister will tell us exactly what the position is with regard to the ownership of these buildings, then we could take a little more time to think of how to tax them and who shall tax them and in what manner.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I wish to draw the attention of the House first to the constitutional provision under Section 362. It reads :

> "In the exercise of the power of Parliament or of the Legislature of a State to make laws or in the exercise of the executive power of the Union or of the State, due regard shall be had to the guarantee or assurance given under any such covenant or agreement as is referred to in clause (1) of article 291 with respect to the personal rights, privileges and dignities of the Ruler of an Indian State."

In pursuance of this, examining the agreement between His Highness the Maharaja and the Central Government, this measure has been brought before this House, and it is seen that not merely the palace and other properties, but there are a large number of buildings and lands, etc., belonging to the Palace. Now the Mysore Municipalities Act, as it existed before, exempted all these properties from taxation and after this agreement was entered into, it was felt that the private properties, except the ones which we have mentioned in pursuance of the agreement, should be taxed. By delaying this legislation, we are depriving the municipality of taxes over a large number of houses. Therefore, I submit that this measure is necessary and also urgent. Government have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the exemption granted here is in pursuance of the assurance and agreement that has been entered into by the Central Government and the Rajpramukh.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—If there is no doubt about the position, may I ask whether the Hon'ble Minister has any objection and if so what is that objection to reading the relative clauses of the agreement ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have already answered that. If and whether we should place a copy of that agreement before this House—it is with the Central Government that the agreement was entered into—it will be examined, and if it is possible, certainly it will be placed before this House.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Does he mean to say that the document is privileged ? Does he mean that the document is not accessible ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The nature of the document will have to be examined. How far it is privileged and whether we could place it before the House is itself a a point for examination.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Does he still think it necessary to proceed with the Bill in that case ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have already indicated the urgency of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard so many doubts being raised in the minds of several Hon'ble Members. It is not my function to explain though I may know something about it; it is for the Government or the mover of the Bill to explain in full beyond doubt. The agreement is not with him at present. In view of these circumstances, I think the Government may consider the desirability of postponing this Bill to the next sitting.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—May I make a suggestion to the Government ? This agreement, if my memory serves me right .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us see what the Government's reply is to my suggestion.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—With due deference to the Chair, we shall take it up at the June Session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The consideration of this Bill is postponed and will be taken up at the next session.

The House will now adjourn and meet again on 15th June 1953.

The House adjourned at Fifty Minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again on 15th June 1953.

WD 4516—GPB—500—2-2-54